

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges that the references of record are not relied upon to reject claims 1-7, which are patentably distinct.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because independent claim 1 is said to fail to recite those components to which the controller is connected. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the invention with greater precision and obviate the objection.

Claim 6 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being deemed to be of improper dependent form because it purportedly has the same limitations as claim 5. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 6 do not have the same limitations. Claim 6 contains the limitations of claim 4 by virtue of its dependency on claim 4. Claim 5 does not depend from claim 4 and therefore does not contain the limitations of claim 4. Accordingly, the scope of claim 6 is different from the scope of claim 5. Claim 6 is truly presented in dependent form, referring back to and further limiting another claim, as required by 37 CFR 1.75(c). Claim 6 is therefore in allowable condition.

As a result of the foregoing, applicant submits that claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the

Examiner feels would best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Dated: July 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William E. Pelton, Esq.

Reg. No. 25,702

Cooper & Dunham LLP

1185 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036

(212) 278-0400

Attorneys for Applicant

F:\TAIE\PTO\69810.res.wpd